

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6 and 17 have been amended and claims 18-20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6 and 17 are independent claims. No new matter has been introduced.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zintel in view of Slaughter et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to further recite, among other features, that the network transmission judging unit is configured to transmit a disable signal for intercepting a transmission of the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit and the preset network transmission possible identifier are different, and to transmit the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier.

These features are supported at least by Figs. 7 and 8 and corresponding portions of the specification. For example, the specification states that when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is not same with the network transmission possible identifier detected in the transmission judgment table, a disable signal for not performing transmission of device characteristic data indicated by the device characteristic identifier is outputted to a microcomputer, and also when the read network transmission possible identifier corresponds to the network transmission possible identifier in the transmission judgment table, the device

characteristic data is transmitted (see Figs. 7 and 8, and page 9, line 24 – page 10, line 3 of the specification).

The Office Action states that Zintel teaches a network stream processing unit configured to parse a device characteristic data of a device and to read a network transmission possible identifier and a device characteristic identifier, the device being automatically detectable in the UPnP based home network (see page 3 of the Office Action). In Zintel, User Control Points initiate discovery and communication with Controlled Devices in a UPnP network, and receive Events from Controlled Devices (see col. 7, lines 9-12 of Zintel). Further, in Zintel, the modules minimally include a Discovery Client, a Description Client, a Rehydrator, an Event Subscription Client and an Event Sink. User Control Points may also include Visual Navigation, a Web browser and an application execution environment (see col. 7, lines 14-19). However, Zintel nowhere teaches transmitting a disable signal for intercepting a transmission of the device characteristic only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit and the preset network transmission possible identifier are different. Zintel does not disclose such disable signal anywhere. Further, Zintel also does not disclose that the device characteristic data is transmitted only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier. Therefore, Zintel fails to teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention.

The Office Action further relies on Slaughter et al. to allege that Slaughter et al. teaches the network transmission possible identifier is set to recognize a device according to a user's authority as well as the judging unit in the claimed invention (see page 3 of the Office Action). Slaughter et al. discloses a client locating a first service within the distributed computing environment; the client requesting a capability credential to allow the client access to a portion of the first service's capabilities depending upon the clients

authorization; the client receiving said capability credential; the client requesting a document that describes the first service's interface to access said portion of the first service's capabilities; the client receiving said document, wherein said document comprises information describing how to access no more than said portion of the first service's capabilities; and the client using the information from said document to access the first service (see claim 1 of Slaughter et al.). In Slaughter et al., the client has to obtain a valid credential from an authentication service before receiving a complete un-protected advertisement, which is needed to use the service (see col. 7, lines 53-58 of Slaughter et al.). Slaughter et al. also discloses that forcing clients to obtain a valid credential may provide additional security for service providers (see col. 7, lines 58-60). However, Slaughter et al. nowhere discloses a disable signal for intercepting a transmission of the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit and the preset network transmission possible identifier are different. Slaughter et al. also fails to disclose that the device characteristic data is transmitted only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier. Therefore, Slaughter et al. fails to teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention.

Hence, the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the network transmission judging unit is configured to transmit a disable signal for intercepting a transmission of the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit and the preset network transmission possible identifier are different, and to transmit the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6 and 17. Accordingly, it is respectfully

submitted amended independent claims 1, 6 and 17, and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC/JSH/jmc